San Joaquin County Pesticide Enforcement Work Plan
1/2011 – 12/2013

Planning and Evaluation Cycle

Pursuant to 3CCR section 6394 "Performance Evaluation", the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR) Director shall evaluate each county pesticide use enforcement program at least every three years. It is agreed upon between CDPR and San Joaquin County that evaluations shall take place on a three year basis.

Pesticide Use Enforcement Personnel Resources

Three Deputy Agricultural Commissioners provide supervision for the county's pesticide use enforcement program. San Joaquin County is currently divided into 9 geographic districts within which Biologists are assigned to perform work in two major departmental program areas: phytosanitary export certification and pesticide use enforcement. Additionally, they perform work in several other minor non-pesticide related departmental programs. Nine District Biologists are primarily responsible for agricultural production pesticide use enforcement. These nine Biologists are assigned to one of three offices: Lodi (3-Biologists), Stockton (3-Biologists) and Simms Station (3-Biologists). One Biologist, designated the Urban Biologist and assigned to the Stockton office, supports the Pesticide Use Enforcement (PUE) Program Deputy on Enforcement Actions and special projects. Investigations and illnesses from industrial, institutional, home and residential sources are rotated through the District Biologist pool. Two standardization Biologists are responsible for structural inspections, illnesses and investigations.

<u>At full staffing levels the following personnel dedicate time to San Joaquin County's pesticide use enforcement program.</u>

12 – Senior Agricultural Biologist, Agricultural Biologist I, or Agricultural Biologist II employees licensed by the Department of Food and Agriculture in Pesticide Use Regulation and Investigation and Environmental Monitoring.

1 – Deputy Agricultural Commissioner, licensed by the Department of Food and Agriculture in Pesticide Use Regulation and Investigation and Environmental Monitoring, responsible for supervising 3 District Biologists, 1 Urban Biologist and overall pesticide use enforcement program performance.

2 – Deputy Agricultural Commissioners licensed by the Department of Food and Agriculture in Pesticide Use Regulation and Investigation and Environmental Monitoring, responsible for supervising the remaining 8 Biologists and assigned departmental program responsibility in non-pesticide related areas.

Support for the above licensed pesticide activities is provided by: 1 – Information System Analyst providing computer support and maintenance of an agricultural field border project

integral to our permit process, 1 – Office Assistant Specialist providing full-time clerical pesticide program support, and 7 – Office Assistants providing additional part-time clerical pesticide program support.

Staffing Level & Program Impacts for **1/2011-12/2013**

Goals projected for this workplan include an Enforcement staff with experience ranging from none to accomplished. Shortfalls will occur in the number of monitoring inspections conducted as biologists continue to gain enforcement experience and their time is divided between surveillance and increasing phytosanitary inspection duties. There were 2 new quarantine pests found in the county in 2010, Light Brown Apple Moth and European Grapevine Moth. A large number of hours, from the Spring to the Fall, were diverted from field enforcement in order to handle quarantine pest protocol's, (i.e. writing compliance agreements, field walking, gathering information from telephone calls and outreach). It is anticipated that even without the discovery of more pests, and filling two Exclusion Biologist vacancies in 2011, additional time will still be diverted from District Biologists PUE activities to support these quarantine pest efforts.

Additionally, San Joaquin County is a test county for the statewide pesticide permitting and use reporting (PPUR) computer system under development. Significant PUE staff time is committed to PPUR development in 2011.

Staffing Level

Information System Analyst: Our GIS Technician hired in 2006 filled this position in 6/2009. He will include in his duties knowledge of the new Pesticide Permitting & Use Reporting System (PPUR) being installed statewide in 2011. GIS field border maintenance will be continued as well as all other department computer maintenance and mapping requests.

Agricultural Biologists by office:

Lodi (3-Biologists) – Fully staffed since 10/2010. A Senior Agricultural Biologist with 8 years pesticide enforcement experience, a Senior Agricultural Biologist with 5 years experience and an Agricultural Biologist II with 3 years enforcement experience.

Simms Station (3-Biologists) – fully staffed since 2009. A fully licensed Agricultural Biologist II with 3 years pesticide enforcement experience, an Agricultural Biologist II with 3 years field experience, and a new Agricultural Biologist I with ½ year field experience.

Stockton (6-Biologists: 3 District, 1 Urban, and 2 Standardization) – the District and Urban positions are fully staffed since 1/2009. A Senior Agricultural Biologist has 15 years experience, an Agricultural Biologist I has 3 years experience and a new Agricultural Biologist I has ½ year experience. As well, the Deputy Agricultural Commissioner responsible for the county's pesticide enforcement program directly supervises this unit. The Urban Biologist duties are assigned to a Senior Agricultural Biologist with 9 years

enforcement experience. Notice of Proposed Action preparation responsibility is part of this position.

From the Standardization Unit are two biologists responsible for non-farm pesticide use enforcement duties: structural, industrial, institutional, home and residential enforcement. Both are Senior Agricultural Biologists with 3 years of years of structural enforcement experience..

Program Impacts
1/2011-12/2013: The Pesticide Enforcement program is fully staffed for the first time since 12/2008. Biologists newly assigned to district responsibilities typically take three years to become expert in their pesticide activities. A large part of this time is used to gain an intimate knowledge (e.g. cropping patterns, pest management, sensitive environmental conditions, permittees, etc.) of their locally assigned geographic area. As a result it is expected that the number of field inspections conducted will continue to be lower than what would be accomplished by a veteran staff. Additionally, the staffing of the PUE unit has left 2 vacancies in the Exclusion unit where our Biologists conducting structural inspections are also assigned. These inspections will be low until our Exclusion Unit is fully staffed.

A. Restricted Materials Permitting

Permit Evaluation - Process Evaluation and Improvement Planning

Permit-Evaluation
Approximately 1,900 restricted material permits and 300 operator identification numbers (OINs) are active in San Joaquin County. Restricted permits are issued on a multi-year and annual year basis. OIN's are effective on an annual basis only. Through 2010, permits and OINs have been generated using a custom software application called RMMS (Restricted Materials Management System). It is anticipated in 2011 a new statewide web-based permitting system, currently named Pesticide Permitting and Use Reporting System (PPUR), will be implemented.

Restricted material permit sites are evaluated prior to issuance of the permit based on review of adjacent and surrounding properties noted on applicant submitted maps, discussion with the applicant, staff's extensive local field knowledge and GIS layers. GIS layers include: a school layer pinpointing the school structure as well as the school property, GWPA's designated by either "run off" or "leaching", 2,4-D special hazardous areas and waterways. The new PPUR system will incorporate our current imagery, plus provide others, such as endangered species locations, California State Parks, watershed boundaries and State designated Wild and Scenic Rivers.

When it is determined that a substantial adverse environmental impact is likely to occur from the use of a restricted material, staff evaluate potential mitigation measures, based on the

local conditions, and include them as a permit condition. The county has standard permit conditions that all permits are conditioned with as appropriate. The county also follows DPR's recommended permit conditions (e.g., methyl bromide, 1,3-dichloropropene, metam sodium and rice pesticides) when appropriate and uses information from previous year pest control evaluations and investigations to issue additional, more specific permit conditions. For example, if an applicant wishes to use a restricted material that has a potential health impact near a school, residential area or public area, staff conditions the permit so that the material may only be used when the school is not in session, public activity is at a minimum, or so that the material can only be used by ground application equipment.

The county denies permits or notices of intents (NOIs) when there are feasible alternatives to reduce adverse environmental impacts. Permits are also denied because of a lack of certification of the applicant. NOIs are denied when adjacent sensitive areas are not identified in the permit or NOI, or a valid permit is not in effect for the use. When a permit is denied, staff fills out a paper permit form and marks "denied." NOIs are noted as denied on the NOI form.

All staff that issue restricted materials permits are designated as a Senior Agricultural Biologist or an Agricultural Biologist I or II and possess current licenses in Pesticide Regulation and Investigation and Environmental Monitoring issued by the California Department of Food and Agriculture. Enforcement staff is knowledgeable in the application of pesticide laws and regulations. Biologist's experience ranges from 1/2 to 15 years in pesticide use enforcement activities.

Staff makes determinations regarding permit applicant qualifications and length of permit duration that are consistent and in compliance with FAC section 14007, 3 CCR sections 6420-6432, and the Pesticide Use Enforcement Program Standards Compendium, Volume 3, Restricted Materials and Permitting.

Goal or Objective

Continue to review and improve the business processes associated with the evaluation of restricted materials permit applications ensuring the protection of San Joaquin County residents and the environment while allowing for timely and effective pest control.

Deliverables

Explain and identify tasks or activities to implement planned improvements:

- Query the permit database in November and provide each biologist with a list of expiring permits with applicant certification status;
- Query our Access Private Applicator Certification (PAC) database in December for renewed PAC holders for use in permit issuance;
- Experienced staff works with any new district biologists during November and December as permits are edited for issuance in the new calendar year;
- QC issued permits for completeness and accuracy prior to filing. Return any permits with errors to Biologists for correction.

Measure Success

The county will query the permit database generating data showing the types of permits issued, permit applicant certification type, and certification expiration date. Any problems noted will be returned to biologists for review. Mismarked and incorrect information will be updated to create accurate permit records. In the event permit applicants are not appropriately certified, permit holders will be notified and given the opportunity to comply. If they cannot comply their permit will be revoked and an OIN issued.

Site-Monitoring Plan

Site-Monitoring Plan Development

The county's selection criteria for monitoring notices of intent (NOIs) to apply restricted pesticides is consistent with the Pesticide Use Enforcement Program Standards Compendium, Volume 3, Restricted Materials and Permitting. NOIs are submitted by phone, recorder, fax, or via a Web-Based NOI site. For verbally submitted NOIs, the required information is filled in on the NOI form. Once in written format, the NOIs are distributed to the biologist responsible for the district in which the application is to occur. Biologists review the NOIs for completeness and will contact the submitter if one is incomplete. After review, Biologists mark NOIs as approved or denied and initial them. Copies of the NOIs are filed in the grower's permit file folder. Biologists screen incoming NOIs and select appropriate NOIs to monitor based on their knowledge of environmentally sensitive sites (e.g. residential areas, industrial areas, waterways, sensitive adjacent crops, etc.) located within their districts, the hazards of the pesticide, and the individuals noncompliance record. NOI's for sites adjacent to schools require a pre-application site evaluation. The county is committed to meeting our mandate to monitor 5% of all NOIs received as per 3CCR section 6436 (one pre-site inspection for every twenty NOIs submitted per district). Fumigants are a high priority. Most fumigants (e.g. methyl bromide, potassium sodium, metam sodium, 1,3-dichloropropene, dazomet, sulfuryl fluoride and chloropicrin) are monitored at a higher than 5% rate, especially those near known sensitive areas.

For 1/2011-12/2013 additional staff reminders will assure that the minimum 5 percent goal is met.

Strengths and Weaknesses

District staff knowledge is our main strength in implementing an effective site-monitoring plan. Seven of our current district biologists have 4 or more years field pesticide use enforcement experience and are well trained and knowledgeable. Supporting identification of adjacent hazards to proposed applications is our current ArcView Field Border Project that identifies adjacent crops and most importantly provides recent aerial imagery that helps identify adjacent sensitive areas such as residential areas and waterways. The aerial imagery included in our new PPUR program will be able to provide the same identification.

An apparent weakness for implementing an effective site-monitoring plan is associated with 2 district biologists with no pesticide field experience. This apparent weakness will be offset

by balancing experienced biologists in each office where new biologists are assigned and taking advantage of any pertinent training. Additionally, our ArcView project is an exceptional tool for identifying adjacent sensitive areas to proposed restricted material applications.

The entire staff is committed for an eight week period every year, approximately April 20-June 15, to the cherry Phytosanitary/F&V Standardization programs. The staff is rotated through weeks on and off of the cherry "project". The staff that is not "on project" covers the daily inspections of incoming shipments, other phytosanitary certification needs and PUE investigations and office work. PUE site monitoring is substantially lower. Special effort to monitor the rice sites where there is use of the targeted rice pesticides is made and we are successful in monitoring for seepage when inspecting for water holding compliance.

Another weakness in our current site-monitoring efforts and the development of an effective site-monitoring plan is our inability to measure our success in targeting and prioritizing specific pesticides or sites for monitoring. Currently, we can account for the total number of NOIs received and the number of pre-application monitoring inspections conducted through hand counts. These simple counts provide for measuring achievement of our mandatory 5% NOI monitoring level both countywide and by individual biologist. However, more complex information is needed to analyze our success in targeting specific high priority pesticides. Specifically, a computerized system for collecting additional NOI and pre-application monitoring information is needed. The system or systems would have to collect information on the number of NOIs received by pesticide as well as what pesticides were monitored during pre-application inspection. Extensive resource commitment is required to develop and maintain or purchase such a software database or databases. Additionally, new business processes would need to be developed to route NOIs to a data entry operator and still maintain paper NOIs in grower permit files. With deployment of the PPUR system in 2011, the ability to receive and evaluate NOI's and perform pesticide targeting queries will also be developed. Dedication of clerical staff to a new data entry task may still be a significant resource commitment for the NOI's that are handwritten. Currently, budget resources are tight.

<u>Goal or Objective</u>
A commitment to implement measures that ensure a site-monitoring plan that takes into consideration pesticide hazards, local conditions, cropping and fieldwork patterns and handler, permittee, and advisor compliance histories, and review of notices of intent as identified in the summary above. The PPUR system will potentially give us this ability upon its rollout, or as a future enhancement.

Selecting specific NOIs for monitoring will be based on recognition of the specific hazard associated with the restricted material and identifying if that hazard exists in close proximity to the proposed application. The knowledge the Biologist's gain about restricted materials associated with high health hazards and of local conditions in their districts is important in choosing which NOI to monitor. These local conditions include knowledge of field cropping patterns, timing of known cultural activities such as weeding, pruning, harvesting, proximity to aquatic sites and irrigation drainage systems. Obtaining CDPR licenses is part of the

probationary period for all Biologists. Continued training is gained in-house and from CDPR classes.

Deliverables

Explain and identify tasks or activities to implement an effective site-monitoring plan:

- Training for new and experienced staff on department identified "high" priority situations based on pesticide by crop, environmental conditions, and other criteria identified in the goal and objectives listed above. This includes the goals set for increased monitoring of specific pesticides.
- Program Manager fully trained in the upcoming PPUR system. Through the new system, we will have the ability to track, prioritize and measure NOI pre-application site monitoring goals.
- Dependent on above deliverable, determine if current clerical resources can absorb the time needed to implement changes in our NOI business process to facilitate local data entry and actual data entry of handwritten NOIs received via phone, fax or recorder.

Measure Success

- Success of the training will be measured by generating reports from the PUE Access program database detailing the pesticide/crop pre-site application monitoring inspections conducted by biologists. This information will be compared to our prioritization plan and monitoring goals. After review any needed departmental or biologist adjustments will be made.
- Assessment of clerical resource availability for data entry of all received handwritten NOIs will be documented. Provided that the assessment finds this project can be implemented with available resources our site-monitoring plan will be adjusted to incorporate this project into our existing site-monitoring plan.

B. Compliance Monitoring

Comprehensive Inspection Plan

Comprehensive Inspection Plan

The PUE Deputy assures that all PUE staff has a copy of the most current inspection procedures manuals and provides periodic Inspection Procedures (general and form specific) training in conjunction with CDPR staff. Supervisors ride along with each PUE biologist during inspection surveillance at least once per year to assure inspections are conducted according to policies and procedures. CDPR staff and veteran district biologists ride along with new PUE staff for training. The PUE Deputy and immediate biologist supervisors review all completed inspection forms to verify that the appropriate inspection procedures are followed and give feedback to staff for training purposes. The PUE Deputy also checks our Access database for the applicator's compliance history. The PUE Deputy's review of the pesticide use monitoring inspections conducted this FY by the staff indicate that the inspections are generally complete and have been conducted according to the Inspection Procedures Manual and other CDPR policies and procedures.

Inspection goals are assigned to each district Biologist for the following types of pesticide use monitoring inspections from the following numbers:

Inspection types	**Annual Countywide Numbers**
application	455
mix/load	182
field fumigation	36
commodity fumigation	18
field worker safety	68

A county registration database (e.g. Pest Control Advisor; Agricultural, Structural, or Maintenance Gardener Pest Control Business, and Dealer) is used to print a list of Headquarters and Records inspections that are due within each biologist's geographic district.

Application inspections are prioritized by risk, such as the hazard of the material and the sensitivity of the site, or by compliance history of the company and if applied by employee handlers. Staff follows the guidelines from the PUE Standards Compendium, Vol. 3, Inspection Procedures manual. Staff has been trained to provide comments and information in the "remarks" area of the inspection forms. In particular, "equipment used" and the elements of the decontamination facility provided or not on site must be included in the "remarks" area.

Inspection weaknesses:

a) In the Reports section, several inspections did not note that follow-up was required and other boxes were left blank, including the noncompliance correction date.
b) Occasionally, the comments section does not contain enough information to document noncompliances found during the inspection.

These weaknesses continue to be improved by close adherence to CDPR policies and procedures and by additional criteria specific training. All forms requiring changes are returned to the district biologist for correction and become discussions points for improving our inspection process. Any changes that result in additional noncompliances are conveyed to the responsible party via phone call and a revised fax copy of the inspection form is sent to them. Staff is encouraged to use the Inspection Report Supplement page.

Inspection strengths:

- Staff is licensed and most have many years of experience.
- Staff is generally very knowledgeable of pesticide related laws and regulations, as well as CDPR policies through access to Enforcement letters.
- Staff has enough and appropriate inspection forms in their vehicle.

- Staff interviews appropriate personnel/supervisors during inspections.
- Staff is conscientious about marking noncompliances as they are first observed in the field.

Goal or Objective

A commitment to implement a comprehensive compliance inspection plan, based on the findings of the annual program evaluation, to ensure pesticide uses are adequately monitored throughout the county.

Deliverables

- Work with our Enforcement Branch Liaison to meet CDPR oversight monitoring goals established for San Joaquin County;
- **Provide training to staff on pesticide inspection form completion focusing on common mistakes on form completion and misunderstood criteria as found during routine form review by supervisory staff;**
- **Schedule staff to attend CDPR workshops on any newly adopted regulations;**
- Schedule staff to attend CDPR fumigation workshops on VOC Regulations;
- Track 30 hour dawn patrol commitment by district biologist to assure this goal is met;
- **Provide fall training** to staff on prioritizing surveillance, for heavy pesticide use periods by crop, to target inspections that monitor use of high-risk pesticides, employee use, and completion of follow-ups.
- Management provides improved periodic updates to staff on needed follow-up inspections, numbers of inspections completed, and dawn patrol hours worked. Where individual goals are not being met supervisors work with staff to identify roadblocks to achieving these goals. Evaluate any identified roadblocks including resource issues and determine if adjustments to the monitoring plan can be made.

Measure Success

- The county will continue to track hours worked in pesticide use monitoring, pre-site applications and pesticide surveillance for the current fiscal year and compare them to hours worked in previous years to determine if full staffing and resource redirection positively impacted the amount of time spent in these areas.
- Numbers of inspections completed and dawn patrol hours worked will be tracked and compared to previous fiscal years.
- The Access PUE Inspection Tracking database will be used to generate a report on follow-up inspection success and compared to previous FY efforts.
- Evaluating the success of the improved staff activity reporting program (Project Costing) that better identifies time spent on activities. Periodic reminders to staff of the correct time codes to place activities under.

Investigation Response and Reporting Improvement

Investigation Response and Reporting

All staff conducting investigations hold licenses in Investigation and Environmental Monitoring. All staff attend CDPR Investigative Training sessions.

Staff responds to all complaints and incidents that may be related to pesticides. When someone files a complaint or the county is informed of an incident that may be pesticide-related, a complaint form is filled out and a tracking number is assigned. The case is entered into a tracking database and referred for investigation to the biologist covering the district in which the incident occurred. The biologist generally contacts the complainant or victim within 24-48 hours. Sometimes the complaint is determined to be more of a question than a complaint, such as what pesticide is being used on a neighboring field, and the determination is documented on the complaint form. True complaints or incidents are investigated and documented in a pesticide episode investigation report. When investigations based on citizen complaints are completed, the results are usually forwarded to the complainant.

The county initiates priority investigations within two working days of the referral, generally within 24 hours. For priority investigations preliminary information is provided to CDPR staff within 15 days of a priority referral or designation and keeps CDPR abreast of the status of the investigation.

The county investigates pesticide related complaints and incidents by following the procedures in the CDPR Investigative Techniques Manual, Investigative Sampling Manual, and Pesticide Episode Investigation Procedures Manual (PEIPM). Investigations are conducted via phone calls, in-person interviews, site visits, and sampling as deemed appropriate for each case. The PUE Deputy contacts the county's Enforcement Branch Liaison (EBL) at the CDPR Northern Regional Office for approval of investigative samples and requests guidance when needed.

Complainants are referred to an appropriate agency (e.g., the Federal Aviation Administration) if the complaint is not under the Commissioner's jurisdiction. We work with other agencies to complete investigations, generally on a case-by-case voluntary basis. Such other agencies include the Department of Fish and Game (DFG), the County Environmental Health Department and Office of Emergency Services (OES), and the local fire departments. The PUE Deputy also attends monthly meetings of the San Joaquin County Toxics Strike Force, which includes OES, Environmental Health, Stockton and County Fire Departments, Sheriff Office, the District Attorney, Department of Toxic Substances Control, State Water Resources Control Board, and DFG.

Prior to submission to CDPR, the supervising Deputy, the PUE Deputy, the Assistant Commissioner, and the Commissioner review investigations. The investigations are thorough and complete, with appropriate witnesses contacted and pesticides identified by brand name and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) registration number, when they could be determined. The investigation of drift complaints usually involves taking residue samples, which are collected in accordance with sampling procedures. The investigation report identifies pesticide violations and the documentation will either support compliance or enforcement action as warranted. An investigation tracking system is in place to assure that investigations are completed within CDPR's 120-day timeframe.

From a 5 year average, we complete the following numbers and types of investigations per year: 2 - Report of Loss, 41 - Illnesses, 47 - Other Investigations. The Other Investigations include complaints of environmental effects, health effects where medical attention was not sought, and crop damage complaints where a report of loss was not submitted.

Investigation Weaknesses

- One District Biologist assignment has no CDPR sponsored investigative training.
- Increased phytosanitary workload takes time away from staff's office time to complete report writing.

Investigation Strengths

- Staff is qualified and well trained to successfully conduct investigations meeting county and CDPR expectations.
- Violations found are well documented supporting enforcement action if warranted by the statewide enforcement regulations.
- Internal tracking database used to track investigation assignment and progress.

Goal or Objective

A commitment to implement an investigation response plan to ensure all investigations are completed in a timely manner with accurate and supportive information.

Deliverables

- New and established staff scheduled to attend Investigative Techniques Training.
- Timely initiation and completion of all non-priority investigations;
- Timely priority investigation initiation and reporting;
- Reassignments of workloads when possible to assure timely report completion.
- Thorough report presentation.
- Thorough report review by management.
- Internal tracking database for illness investigation assignment and progress monitoring.

Measure Success

- Generation of monthly progress reports for tracking investigation completion and year-end analysis for timeliness of investigation completion.
- Monitor if CDPR's Worker Health and Safety Branch returns any illness investigations for incompleteness.

C. Enforcement Response

Enforcement Response Evaluation

A review of inspections, investigations, and enforcement and compliance actions indicate that the cited sections accurately reflected the violations. The CDPR adopted Enforcement Response Regulations (ERR) are followed.

When staff identifies violations, they issue either an inspection form with the noncompliance marked or a violation notice. Sometimes a warning letter will be issued for violations made

by non-permittees such as homeowners, or when a fuller description of the violation is appropriate. Our Access PUE database facilitates electronically tracking two-year histories for violators of pesticide laws and regulations. They also track a two-year history for repeat violations as defined in the Enforcement Response Regulations. A two-year history is also kept in the permittee/business files. Staff reviews the history of the violator in the database when they find noncompliances to determine if further action is appropriate. Querying issued notices of violations, noncompliances noted on inspection forms, and warning letters provides an entire overall compliance history for individuals or businesses. The decision whether enforcement action is appropriate to take and the appropriate enforcement option to apply is determined after reviewing compliance history and the Enforcement Response Regulation, and then discussing the incident and history between the Deputy supervising the district in which the incident occurred, the PUE Deputy, the Assistant Commissioner and the Commissioner.

The Notices of Proposed Action (NOPA) issued by the county advises respondents of the alleged violation(s), the proposed fine level, and their right for an opportunity to be heard. A brochure "Preparing for your Administrative Pesticide Penalty Hearing" is included with the NOPA. Fine amounts are categorized in a manner consistent with the fine guidelines in 3CCR section 6130. No structural actions were taken this year using Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 1922.

From a 5-year historical average, we issue 37 NOPA's per year.

Enforcement Response Weaknesses

- None noted.

Enforcement Response Strengths

- Knowledgeable staff identifies violations meeting Enforcement Response Regulation triggers for initiating enforcement actions.
- Violation documentation supports taking appropriate enforcement action.
- NOPAs provide respondents with due process by describing alleged violations, the proposed fine level, and their right for an opportunity to be heard.

Goal or Objective

A commitment to follow the statewide Enforcement Response Regulations associated with violations of pesticide laws and regulations ensuring enforcement actions are rendered fairly, consistently, and swiftly.

Deliverables

- Continue to implement changes to the Enforcement Guidelines contained in current and new Enforcement Response Regulations.
- Provide an Enforcement Response Regulation Update to the regulated community during grower meetings and PAPA continuing education seminars.

Measure Success

- Generate periodic and year-end reports that detail enforcement responses for analysis of our stated goals.

D. Educational Outreach

Educational Outreach Evaluation

The county conducts educational outreach to provide opportunities for the regulated community to become knowledgeable in pesticide laws and regulations and meet continuing education (CE) requirements for renewal of county issued private applicator certificates and DPR issued licenses. Additionally, the county participates in and organizes employee handler general pesticide safety training. Outreach is in the form of both lecture style seminars and hands-on workshops.

Growers interested in using restricted pesticides must hold as a minimum a county issued private applicator certificate. These certificates are renewed every three years by earning 6 hours of CE or taking a written exam. The county is committed to annually provide growers, desiring to renew certificates by the CE method, 2 hour educational sessions. These sessions are lecture style seminars designed to educate growers in regulatory changes pertinent to San Joaquin County and review employee worker safety issues. **Multiple sessions are offered in November and December of each year (approximately 7 day, 2 night).** This time frame best meets county resource availability issues (it doesn't conflict with permit issuance or impact pesticide use monitoring since fewer applications take place at this time) and fits a normal slow period for growers and their farming activities. A committee forms each year consisting of three District Biologists (one from each division) and the PUE Deputy. The committee decides on training topics and designs a PowerPoint program for presentation to the growers. Approximately 1300 growers and 100 licensees attend these sessions. Grower feedback is positive on both session presentation and content. Growers want to learn about pesticide issues from the local experts.

Employee pesticide handlers learn better in a hands-on workshop setting rather than a lecture style seminar. The county participates in the Lodi Farm Safety Day. This workshop is modeled after the UC Davis Train-The-Trainer Program and is given in Spanish and English. Worker safety requirements with low compliance, as seen in use monitoring inspections, are targeted topics at this workshop. Annually, 450 employees attend the Lodi workshop, which is organized by a grower member committee of Lodi's Chamber of Commerce. This workshop enjoys enthusiastic grower support.

Our other annual training commitments include speaking at mandatory Farm Labor Contractor training held three times a year for contractor license renewal and the Stockton and Tracy PAPA seminars. Periodically, training sponsors request county speakers for other training sessions and we meet those requests as resources allow.

San Joaquin County growers took part in joining a growing group of interested growers and agricultural industry members Statewide by having their first Spray Safe event the summer of

2009. This event is now annual with 2011's Spray Safe event scheduled for February. Our office fully supports and participates in each event. 300 participants annually attend.

Educational Outreach Weaknesses

- Resource constraints don't allow the county to meet the grower demand for expansion of our employee hands-on workshops.

Educational Outreach Strengths

- Training is designed to target San Joaquin County pesticide regulatory issues.
- The local experts provide local training.
- In-house Biologist is bilingual in Spanish
- Growers holding private applicator certificates can easily renew certificates via the CE method.
- Employee training is delivered in a style (hands-on) best suited for employees.
- Hands-on training is offered in Spanish and English.

Goal or Objective

Our commitment is to continue to offer and improve the county's educational outreach program and deliver information on pesticide laws and regulations pertinent to the regulated community in San Joaquin County.

Deliverables

- **A**nnual grower meetings
- 1 employee pesticide training hands-on workshop
- 1 Tracy PAPA seminar
- 1 Stockton PAPA seminar
- 3 Farm Labor Contractor License renewal seminar
- Annual Spray Safe event
- Additional seminars as resources allow.

Measure Success

- Maintain statistics on training attendance.
- Collate feedback from questionnaires meeting participants are encouraged to fill out.